

absurd only if one thinks of arranging such rocks on a shelf and giving them classmarks. It is the importation into Arunta land of a single-minded obsession with book-forms, in the highly relative context of the last few hundred years of European history, which is the real absurdity" (p. 32-33). McKenzie's thinking about texts is profound and I am sure that what he (and others) are saying will come to have implications for us as librarians. But what also occurs to me is that we could have learnt that too - if only we had approached the matter of the Maori people and libraries in a truly consultative fashion. Because we haven't, from a professional point of view we have missed an opportunity to accession and make available in some remarkable and innovative ways, a great range of Maori texts. But it is not just a failure in our professional competence that is disappointing here, but the failure to respect and appreciate the Maori people and to promote the country's unique library of literature.

By not broadening our minds to a real appreciation of Maori language and literature, we have narrowed our own horizons and played out a role solely modelled on the other, although also relevant, Pakeha tradition. But what about the tradition that was already there, and is still here? We have, to borrow a phrase from Cliff Lashley's article on the development of West Indian libraries, to build a great tradition of our own; one which respects both Maori and Pakeha ("West Indian National Libraries and the Challenge of Change" in Ingram K. E. & A. A. Jefferson (eds), 1975, *Libraries and the Challenge of Change*, Papers of the International Library Conference held in Kingston, Jamaica, 24-29 April, 1972.)

In choosing only to talk about language and literature, I am of course just touching the surface of the vast and fascinating learning that can be done about Maori culture, about the physical environment the Maori people inhabit, and about the tikanga or customs that relate to their environment and beliefs. But to give real attention to any of those areas, there has to be, as there has to be for any real learning, a concurrent attitude that is open and enquiring. There also has to be willingness to consult, to go to those who can do the teaching, in this case to Maori people. That same attitude, of openness and enquiry and willingness to consult, must inform our interaction with people, if our intentions about biculturalism are to be substantiated by action and our libraries are to be accountable to our communities.

What I have suggested in this paper is that as librarians we have been holding views on biculturalism and attempting to put them into practice on our own, constructing

theories about what is appropriate and failing to consult with those whom the theory is about as to whether it is acceptable. Such a methodology wouldn't hold up in the scientific world, and it doesn't hold up in the human world either. If we make assumptions about what people want, we are very likely to be wrong; the less we know them, the more likely we are to be wrong. The process of consultation, of checking one's assumptions, underpins the best thinking and scholarly study; it also underpins the best interaction between people, and is essential to democratic decision-making. (That process can be explored more fully in the works of, for example, Chris Argyris, Reason, *Learning and Action*, 1982, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass; Chris Argyris & Donald Schon, *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*, 1976, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass; and Michael Absolum, "Behaving for the Future: Developing Processes for Democratic Relating", Unpublished Thesis, Dip.Ed.Psych, AU, 1985.)

If librarians take up the challenge to become bicultural using a model of consultation and democratic decision making, then they have a greater chance of being relevant to the many communities that they serve. It is a strange, perhaps telling thing, that the issue of user pays has highlighted this. Suddenly we are concerned about accountability, that what we do is approved by our clients. Michael Kirby made the points at last year's Conference that the promotion of fee-based services might have the beneficial consequence of increasing the effective accountability of librarians to their users, and that in every profession there have been significant moves to increase the accountability of important decision-making to the community being served ("User pays, libraries and accountability", *New Zealand Libraries*, Vol. 45, No. 10, June 1988, p.209-210). It's interesting that the user pays philosophy has prompted us to consider an accountability that should, after all, always have been there.

I have suggested in this paper that, despite some efforts to the contrary, our libraries remain largely monocultural. I think that an impediment to our success with biculturalism has been our Pakeha closedness to Maori people and their culture. If as a profession we espouse the partnership principle of the Treaty, then we must set about doing our part properly. When the profession and Maori people come to consult with each other over the development of libraries, then we will have libraries which serve the needs of both our cultures. Kia ora.

Jane McRae is the Maori Studies Librarian at Te Hukatai, University of Auckland Library.

Meet My Koro . . .

CUSHLA PAREKOWHAI (1989 Conference paper)

You know times like this usually make me a bit nervous eh. I sort of hop up, have a look around and think "O Crikey what am I supposed to say next?" For me this feels pretty strange really since I'm a talker eh. Always have been. One of those bloody cheery wide-mouth frogs, who never shuts up. So here we are then. Eeek! You out there, smiling away just beautiful and me up here wondering — "O.K. so what do we do now?"

Probably the best way to begin this is to describe for you the circumstances which resulted in this opportunity to speak. It's quite interesting when you really get down to it. Last year I was involved with a group of students all doing the Dip.Libship. at the Library School at Victoria University in Wellington. Around about that time the Joint Advisory Committee on Library Education asked for submissions on the Saunders Report which had been

commissioned the previous year. Well some weeks later deep in darkest Kelburn, over mountains of empty cappuccino cups a few formerly cheery wide-mouth frogs got together and started talking. We had to look at the Saunders Report and pretty soon it seemed to us that this influential and learned document, which so it said faithfully transcribed what it was that working librarians wanted to say about the proposed direction that Libr.Ed ought to take, *nowhere* acknowledged a fairly significant shift in contemporary NZ attitude and thinking. That shift was of course the realisation that this land is a bi-cultural space where two peoples have already voiced a strong bi-cultural commitment that will, we trust, begin to resolve the inequities which remain as the oppressive legacy of our long colonial past.

Well that's what we thought anyway. In other professions and in top-level government agencies it seemed to us some kind of bi-cultural process had obviously begun. The rest of the country was saying hey what about Maori? While notably the Library world still said nothing. So it was that this small but vocal band of Library School students and associated wide-mouth frogs reckoned they ought to do something. After a few late night talk sessions we formed ourselves into this collective called Te Ropu Takawaenga — the Mediators or Bridge-Builders Group and wrote a submission on the lack of bi-cultural perspective inherent in the recommendations made by the Saunders Report. This paper was circulated and endorsed by a number of student colleagues, library professionals and interested others who similarly wished to articulate their concern. A copy of the submission plus an informal discussion paper which addressed issues raised by original take were subsequently published in our professional journal *Library Life*. When you look at it I suppose we got a good response really for a bunch of wide-mouth frogs that is. There was a thoughtful and provocative letter from the Professor of our School acknowledging what it was we were saying. There were several staunch letters from both Jane McRae from Te Hukatai, Maori Studies Librarian, and a few other people up North and also a couple of urgent faxes from supportive colleagues right here in Otago — not to mention a very nice morning teatime chat with the Acting Vice-Chancellor of Victoria University who was both generous and informed. So you see heaps of positive people were saying heaps of positive things. Just like that. For instance some of our Library school lecturers took themselves off to University hui and were elected to a University Staff Committee looking at bi-cultural, non-racist approaches to their particular teaching environment. The Wellington branch of the NZLA initiated a successful winter series of bi-cultural workshops and National Library convened a short bi-cultural forum at which a representative from Project Waitangi — the Pakeha driven educational campaign for bi-cultural awareness — spoke to Library professionals at all levels of the organisation. The key issue addressed by these librarians was the immediate need for institutional change in order that the National Library may at last give genuine expression to the principles of equity and partnership espoused by the Treaty of Waitangi. So you know things are happening eh? It's like I feel mine is not the only voice. Just as Jane McRae here has spoken before me today there have been numerous others as well, some of whom have been participants in hui just like this. And it seems to me that we are all saying the same thing in different voices perhaps but together

nonetheless.

So why was it then that non-Pakeha issues inadvertently fell off our professional agenda yet again? Maori wishes and the acknowledged responsibility of good librarians to be accountable to them significantly failed to be included in any of the original planning for this conference. In fact it wasn't until this omission was pointed out to the organising committee by individuals and groups not directly involved with the NZLA that the likelihood of holding a session such as this became a reality. Given the present context in which we now find ourselves this must be a bit of a worry. It is ironic surely if you remember that the prescribed theme of this year's conference asks us to consider the notion of "making contact." The question remains contact with *whom*? Not Maori we assume. The people with whom Librarians are supposed to make contact will be Pakehas of course — and these Pakeha will be (and I mean this caringly possums) mostly privileged, white, middle-class literate ones at that.

Fortunately however it seems that conference proceedings had not been set in concrete and efforts were made to correct this unhappy state of affairs. Those people who had drawn this oversight to the attention of the organising committee were approached then expected to provide instant on-tap expertise which would conveniently solve the problem. So I suppose that is why an average garden-sized indigenous know-all just like me gets wheeled in here in order to perform an appropriate bi-cultural genuflection. No matter. Here we are *anyway*. . . Predictably for this national gathering of Librarians it seems that Maori interests are not regarded as a necessary and integral part of proceedings. As usual Maori take are represented as a single and isolated component in one afternoon session which features only in the parallel programme. Typically Maori interests must compete for valuable audience and ear-space against a number of other worthy sessions encompassing diverse issues ranging from *The Role of Commercial Information Services* to *Negotiating Difference*, not forgetting of course the short but intensive course in Californian corporate management-speak that will assist us in *Finding the Best in Each Other*. No doubt all of these contributions have a relevant place in this forum and will merit serious and considered professional attention but it is regrettable I think that librarianship still generally regards issues relating to Maori as some kind of "optional extra" — an incidental splash of cultural froth to be selectively included in their annual conference as programming and liberal inclination might allow. . .

So now I would like you to meet my koro. I "borrowed" him from Auckland Public Library's Art Print Collection and he has come with me to the Conference. His christian name is Pera Tutoko but he was once known as Te Rangituatahi. My koro belongs to the Nga Potiki hapū of Te Aitanga a Mahaki people who come from the Turanga/Gisborne area. This koro is my koro because his son was Hemi Kehukehu and Hemi Kehukehu married the first Kararaina of Kaitara — and this is the Kararaina after whom I was named since my name is Kararaina also. Now Hemi Kehukehu and Kararaina's daughter was Riria who married Polgrain the Pakeha and their child was Ani Merata and she married Raniera Rylan and their son was Wi-Matara — my grandfather who married Pani Turangi and their third child is my father George Whakataka who had five children. The oldest boy is my brother David Tutoko who was named after this old man in the picture,

but the eldest child and only daughter is Cushla Kararaina and that's me.

So that is how this koro is my koro. I have described for you that whakapapa or genealogy which makes the connection between this image and myself. As you have heard this relationship is a living connection — a living connection which transcends all time and all space and links one person to another, the first name to the same name, one generation to the next. But like my koro before it the story of this image has a life of its own. The picture you see today was painted in the early 1890s by Gottfried Lindauer from a photograph. My koro never sat for this portrait and probably did not know that his image had become a painting as well. For years, generations in fact my family was unaware that the painting and the photograph of our koro ever existed. As a boy my father had heard from his father that there was an image of Pera somewhere but no one in the family had ever seen it. This is not unusual because for Maori pictures or photographs particularly of significant people are regarded as taonga. In the past, as gestures of the most highest regard these images were gifted away to others or passed out of the kin group. In the early part of this century the rapidly changing social order meant that the structures which had traditionally ensured the return of these images to the donor people were gradually undermined and often overlooked. In this way a number of images were alienated and lost to the people to whom these taonga correctly belonged. In the case of my koro it seems that within three generations only, without the possibility of access to or possession of the image my family's knowledge of Pera's picture had become just a "memory" — the talked about shadow of a shape no-one had ever seen.

Years later my father was a young student in Wellington. One day my father happened to be browsing in the NZ Room at Wellington Public Library where suddenly he came across an ancient copy of *Pictures of Old New Zealand* being from the *Partridge Collection of Maori Paintings* by Gottfried Lindauer as described by James Cowan. In this book my father found the lost portrait of Pera. So my father just like myself "borrowed" our koro from the Public Library and took him all the way back to Gisborne where he gave the book to my Grandfather who upon receiving it, looked at the picture and saw himself. On a subsequent trip to Auckland my father went to Auckland City Art Gallery and asked to see our koro. In those days the Partridge Collection of Maori portraits was not on permanent display and our koro had to be brought up from the basement where he was neatly packed away in cold storage. My father checked that the biographical information supplied by Cowan was correct and he noted that on the back of the painting written in pencil was the word Kaitara. Kaitara is the place where by grandfather lived and where members of my family still live to this day. "Yep", my father thought "that's our koro all right" and away he went. So knowledge of the Lindauer portrait of Pera returned to the family and many of my relatives made special efforts to see him. Years passed and then in 1978 Keith Sinclair and Wendy Harre published their photographic history of NZ "Looking Back". And right there in the first page of pictures was a photograph of my koro which so it said "was reproduced by kind permission of the Gisborne Museum Collection". This was one of the first times that my family had seen the picture from which Lindauer must have painted the portrait. My father looked

at the captioning which accompanied the photograph of Pera and saw that the description given him was incorrect. The image in this text purported to be that of Pera Te Watutu of Gisborne. Now my father knew that in the Gisborne area whakapapa there were several different tipuna named Pera or Aperaham/Abraham. To his knowledge none of these Pera was ever called Te Watutu. In fact the name given by Sinclair or Harre referred to no known person at all. My father concluded that the Te Watutu cited was most probably a mis-spelling of Tūtoko or some such error of this nature. And so as my father himself said when we originally discussed the possibility of bringing our koro to conference he at that time had sincerely "resolved in his heart" to do something about correcting Koro's name the very next occasion he went past the Gisborne Museum. But things being what they are seven years soon passed and in 1985 the eminent translator and ethnologist Margaret Orbell published her beautifully illustrated book *Natural World of the Maori*. And there on page 189 was the same photograph of my koro not looking at all happy still identified by the erroneous name Pera Te Wātutu. However, my father even with the benefit of a true heart and good intent hadn't exactly gotten around to acting. Next time, he thought, next time.

The following year in 1986 out came Judith Binney's new book *Ngaa Morehuu: the Survivors*. This book told the life stories of old kiua connected with the Ringatu faith. Now one of the women interviewed by Judy Binney for the book is an old lady called Heni MacDonald. As Heni MacDonald is talking about her experiences being married to her husband Edward Mokopuna Brown, deceased, on the page opposite there appears again the photograph of my koro. This time the picture is described as being one Pera Te Uetuku (Pera Tutoko). In this case, the way in which the photograph is captioned seems to suggest that Pera Te Uetuku & Pera Tūtoko are the same person. The important thing here is that there was in fact a tipuna called Pera Te Uetuku and his descendants are members of the Brown Family to which Heni MacDonald's deceased husband Edward Mokopuna Brown belonged. This Pera Te Uetuku although he lived in the Poverty Bay area was certainly not the same person as my koro Pera Tūtoko of Kaitara. As it happened at that time I was finishing my MA at Auckland University. That year a close associate of Dr Binney's was my tutor. Knowing about my interest in the recently published book, my tutor had said that Judy was especially interested in any comment that me or my family might like to make. So then after speaking to my father I was able to convey to Dr Binney something about the confusion associated with the correct identification of the photograph. Dr Binney was very grateful to receive this information, and subsequently in the second edition of *Ngaa Morehuu* published in 1988 the photograph of my koro was withdrawn. So it was that early this year, my mother and father were in Gisborne on family business. And at last making good his resolution of ten years earlier my father made a special trip to the Gisborne Museum. After speaking to the photographic librarian my father asked to see the picture of our koro. The photograph was quickly and efficiently produced. As it turned out it seemed that the old lady Heni MacDonald had herself only recently been to the Museum since my koro's photograph had not yet been returned to the file. On her visit to the museum Heni MacDonald had also spoken to the librarian and she had disclaimed the implication that her husband's tipuna

Pera Te Uetuku & Pera Tūtoko were the same person. When my father looked at the information collected by generations of librarians, archivists and curators at the Museum he found that over the years all the details regarding this image had been conscientiously recorded.

Dr Binney had in fact been in contact with the museum and passed on the information she received. This was verified by the visit of Heni MacDonald who had told the museum that the photograph was not that of Pera Te Uetuku her husband's tipuna. Furthermore because she was not herself a descendent of the other Pera she would not assume the right to positively identify the photograph at all. Seeing that there now seemed to be no clear claimant to the picture the librarian had noted that the whakapapa for this photograph was unfortunately "unknown". At this stage my father was able to write down the whakapapa the one which I recited for you earlier that would identify the image and connect it with himself and those others of Pera Tūtoko's descendants living today. So this is the story of my koro who once had three very different names. His real name, somebody else's name and a non-existent nonsense name. These days he looks pretty happy and sometimes when you least expect he just might wink. . .

It has been said that there are in this world two kinds of people — the uninformed and the misinformed. Where information about Pakeha material is extensively cross referenced and indexed, Maori sources are not. It is likely therefore that institutions will be looking at Maori material wrongly. It may even be that because the library, archive, or museum cannot see as Maori see the institution could find itself the unwitting purveyor of misinformation. Fortunately, as the story of my koro's picture suggests there are people around who know. What needs to happen is that the Library should develop some structure to promote small scale local or regional research where those informed individuals out there in the community are given the opportunity to provide that knowledge which will offer real insight into collections. It would seem that tapping into this valuable people based memory bank is one way in which the library can begin to make new contact with their users and the wider community of which they are part. For Maori people particularly the ability to believe that the Library houses something that is important and meaningful to them means that for that one individual a relationship with the institution is already assured. This personal connection or the recognition of what it is in this place that is relevant and useful to me is precisely the kind of contact that libraries should be in the business of making. Libraries ought to help put people back together — put them in touch — assist in making those connections that will allow an individual view of the world to become larger and more dynamic than it was. Every day in our working experience either on the reference desk or at the catalogue librarians are presented with the possibility of making those connections from which might develop a relationship between the people and the items or images in our care. And it may even be that in terms of this connection or living link the librarian does not actually need to be there at all. For if the librarian was to suddenly disappear the energy and thinking communicated in the real relationship between the non-Pakeha library user and the item or image itself would like my koro and his whakapapa always remain.

The perceived difficulty of making contact with non-Pakeha people is at this very moment being innovatively explored in the New Zealand & Pacific Dept, Auckland

Public Library. While talking to people about what needed to be said in this paper, Auckland Public Library's New Zealand & Pacific Dept launched their current display of unidentified Maori portraits. All these images were rescued from the closed drawers of filing cabinets where they had languished in the pouritanga or darkness of anonymity and were given over to the world of te ao marama, the broad light of day as guaranteed to them by the protective glass of the permanent display. These images sit together quietly waiting to be recognised, waiting to be acknowledged by their own people that they also can be reclaimed and restored with dignity to their rightful place alongside all the other ancestors whose generous spirits make real that particular energy often attributed to the collection of photographs itself. This is precisely the energy with which librarians have been entrusted given that we are, as in the words of another, "custodians of those most precious treasures of the human spirit". However, recognition of this responsibility should not preclude the possibility of librarians critically assessing their own attitudes and practices and changing them where necessary. For example in the exhibition of unidentified Maori portraits at Auckland Public Library, the captioning is entirely bi-lingual. In te reo the sign above the display case reads,

"Ko eenei whakaahua noo taa matou koputu oo ngaa whakaahua oo ngaa Maaori engari kiihai i te mohio-tia ake ko wai raatou.

Mehemea e mohio ana koe ki enei tangata koorero mai . . ." and in English it appears as,

"These photographs are from our collection of Maori portraits in which the people are unidentified. If you can identify any of these people please let us know . . ."

In this case the use of both languages as a way of making contact acknowledges that on some occasions the information which might be provided will be in te reo. This one statement suggests that this library structure has the ability to deal with information that could come to it from non-Pakeha informants. In the case of Auckland Public Library this ability is represented by the established "Maori Specialist" position currently occupied by Maori writer and fluent speaker Rangitunoa Black. This specialist position has been previously held by two other Maori people namely Wharehuia Hemara of National Library and myself, and both of us after being in this job subsequently went on to complete Diplomas in Librarianship. It could be argued that the Maori specialist position available at Auckland Public Library has been the single most important factor in attracting Maori people to professional librarianship as viable career options. Personally if it weren't for the positive experiences I had while in that job and the valuable insights that it gave me into the nature of information and the difficulty that Maori people have in achieving access to it I would not be standing up here speaking with you today. It is my view that when libraries are asking themselves how can we get more Maori into our libraries the fact is that there are heaps of Maori people in there already. But of course these Maori are "invisible" Maori, the ones whose sphere of influence rarely extends beyond the cafeteria or the cart-dock. Except of course on those occasions when the library must provide a pōwhiri for a visiting dignitary or a speech for the City Librarian going onto a marae. The problem is that that Library has difficulty even recognising the range of expertise and

special skills available to them right under its ihu. Pity. Because these people have valuable contributions to make but predictably most Maori who are already part of the library structure operate at low levels within the organisation. They are not involved or consulted when management is making those kinds of decisions that will affect changes in attitude or policy. So naturally enough nothing changes. The interests of Maori people are not represented at those levels which will significantly impinge on the consciousness of administrators. Those of us who attempt to change things certainly make enough noise but we are only few. There needs to be heaps more. This is where libraries can in my view take positive and immediate steps to ensure that more Maori people begin to be directly involved in various levels of decision making. As a baseline this would not necessarily be a difficult possibility to explore given that incentives are now available to employers and institutions which can provide a range of work experience options for school leavers. It would not be impossible for a library to set up some kind of paid library orientation programme where Maori young people are introduced gently to the working reality of the library system. It is also important that Maori young people begin to see that the library is not only a good place to be but that it is also one in which a few of your mates could be sitting up large on Information Desk. The initial groundwork has been done. Libraries do attract Maori people. The value of what libraries have to offer is not in dispute. The problem is because there are already Maori people in libraries how do you set about retaining them? This desirable end result can be achieved I think by initiating a recruitment and staffing policy which takes serious affirmative action over the range of employment opportunities now available to Maori people in libraries. It seems necessary that not only should there be more senior assistants positions with designated responsibility for Maori materials but that there should also be, at least, corresponding spaces available at student assistant or vacation worker level which are open only to Maori young people. These positions could function with regard to all aspects of library activity but especially in order that Maori young people can work in a close learning association with the permanent Maori specialist. For these types of appointments thought ought to be given to existing selection criteria. Perhaps some of the old Pakeha inspired qualifications could be waived or re-defined so that those non-Pakeha life and inter-personal skills needed by a Maori Librarian with responsibility for Maori materials may be given the professional consideration they deserve. It seems to me some kind of redundant liberal gesture to acknowledge what it is that Maori people are presently saying about Maori control of Maori things if the existing structure does not provide an adequate means by which this autonomous control can be successfully achieved. It is all very well to speak of power sharing and partnership, when there are not enough skilled and experienced Maori trained to take over from where the Pakehas leave off. Libraries need to maintain an on-going and consistent recruitment programme which will allow Maori people the practical resources to independently manage libraries and resource centres of their own. The question of recruitment and staffing seems to be an area where librarianship can put into real effect the implications of that bi-cultural promise articulated by many but enacted by few. Librarianship could not propose any more appropriate commemoration in 1990 than to initiate now those

changes in policy or attitude which will affirm in real terms the claims to equal status and shared resources which was guaranteed to us 150 years ago by the Treaty of Waitangi.

So it is then that my connection with Librarianship developed from having been the Maori specialist at Auckland Public Library. It is no accident either that the existing Maori specialist Rangitunoa Black has curated the exhibition of unidentified Maori portraits which might for some other person offer back the images of their koro and kuia. It is appropriate therefore to speak finally about the real nature of these images themselves.

Visual images and photographs particularly are a useful way for librarians to think about a number of non-Pakeha items found in their collections. It is possible to suggest that given Maori notions of spirituality the image contains much more than what is seemingly visible. For example where the subject has agreed to be photographed Maori would say that the subject has likewise agreed to be available for public view. Furthermore Maori would also probably say that the viewer is also conscious of what it is that the image is conscious of. Where this awareness is mis-matched, the "real" image which expresses itself as positive energy either wanes or disappears. Where the people have agreed to being photographed that agreement is recorded in the image as well.

This principle which could in the future become an important basis for meaningful power-sharing has been best described by the well known and respected NZ film maker John O'Shea. John O'Shea talks about how as an image maker he and his co-workers at Pacific Films have come to see themselves not as "people who 'take' pictures. . . but rather those who are 'given' [those] images." John O'Shea goes on to say that as a film maker who has extensively photographed Maori people he no longer arrogantly believes that he "owns" these images at all. Therefore he cannot assume the rights to claim copyright as demanded by the small minded contractual obligations prescribed by Pakeha dominated distribution agencies. The situation was resolved for John O'Shea and Pacific Films after consultation with kaumatua and Maori friends where it was agreed that for moving pictures "where an initial trust has been established a principle of *mana-tuturu*", obtains. This acknowledgement indicates that the *mana-tuturu* or permanent influence and prestige reside with the donor of the images while copyright can be exercised by the recipient. With regard to this principle of *mana-tuturu* the implication for Librarianship seems to be that images and items can now be seen as having a recognised value to Maori people which is different but equal to that claimed by the library itself. That is to say that the "ownership" of the image could mean different things to different people depending on their particular individual connection but that the structure has the ability to accommodate and act on this distinction. For me and my koro then the value of this image will be much more than the arbitrary label ascribed to him by the Auckland Public Library as Borrowing Copy Art Print Number 1769. For the institution the picture of my koro has a visual reality which resembles a limited edition reproduction of an original painting by Gottfried Lindauer. But for me and my family there is a metaphysical reality also. In this reality the appearance of our koro provides information and power to our kin-group only. This is not a reality often understood by Pakehas but it is the one that can never be alienated or taken away. It is the *mana-tuturu* which stays with my family when the image

of my koro is up in stacks or out there on loan. In fact it may even be that it is not I who have borrowed my koro from the library but rather that the Library has borrowed my koro from me. For it is merely the thin ephemeral physical shadow over which the library has real control. That which is the true substance of this image belongs entirely to those people who see in this picture the accurate reflection of themselves.

So it makes you wonder eh about who exactly "owns" what. Could be that Librarians may at last begin to think about a meaningful bi-cultural partnership if genuine status

is given to the mana-tuturu maintained by the undiminished generosity of spirit of Maori people. But on the other hand you'll never guess what I've been thinking. When me and my koro go home to Auckland some day I could forget to take him back to the Library. But then again someday maybe I won't. Hard to say really.

Cushla Parekowhai is currently researching and writing for the Book of New Zealand Women at the Stout Centre, Victoria University of Wellington.

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND PUBLIC LIBRARY GOODNESS

ELEANOR JO RODGER (1989 Conference paper)

There is a lot at stake when we begin to measure performance in public libraries - or in any other institution or agency. If we are thoughtful, we try to count what matters, things that are important either positively or negatively. Museums count numbers of people who attend special exhibitions. Airplanes count numbers of paid passenger miles. Hospitals regularly review their empty bed ratios. Fire departments monitor response time. Libraries count circulation, reference questions, and a number of other things, all, presumably because they are important. To be able to agree on what is important to measure, we must share some assumptions about what it means to be good in each one of these arenas. Museum managers seem to agree that it matters that people attend exhibitions. Airline executives know that they can't afford to run empty planes around the world. Hospitals, interestingly enough, don't know quite how to think about empty bed ratios. The bed space costs money to maintain, empty or full. Hospital marketing departments in the States now are positioning their institutions as "wellness centers." Increasing numbers of empty beds may be a sign of success, not failure, with this interpretation of mission. Fast response time is obviously crucial to fire departments. In the library world, we have had some shared sense that circulation matters, that numbers of reference questions matter - and a few other things.

Before launching into either a defence of or a cry for wider participation in performance measurement in public libraries, it is imperative to revisit the notions of public library goodness, just to be certain that the things we measure, the questions we ask, truly do relate to being a good public library.

We should be a bit wary
Of the little library
Right in the middle of the county.
For when it is good, it is very, very good
And when it is bad, it's "a pretty good library for a town this size."

A. Public Library Goodness

What is "a pretty good library for a town this size?" How do we know that? Do we expect other people to agree?

We used to have national standards for public libraries

in the States. You knew you were good if you had X number of volumes and/or square feet for each person in your community. We then began to understand, however, that it didn't matter to the person who walked in off the street how many volumes were on the shelf if none of them was the one he or she wanted. So we changed our focus to measuring outcomes or outputs.

We acknowledge that there were - and are - differing notions of what it means to be good. Librarians, steadfastly pursuing increases in book budgets, and aware of the ever increasing numbers of materials being published, had measured success in terms of volumes owned, and usually also in terms of volumes circulated. Interestingly, in the early days of American public librarianship there was tension between the assumptions underlying these measures in some libraries, reflected in lending policies that stipulated only one book per person could be borrowed. Behind the materials availability rates in *Output Measures for Public Libraries* clearly is the assumption that it is good to have the materials people want to use. Our assumptions have become more market oriented.

The newest light shed on the issue of public library goodness comes from an "almost-ready-for publication" study known as The Public Library Effectiveness Study, being completed now by Thomas Childers of Drexel University and Nancy Van House of the University of California at Berkeley¹. Funded by the U.S. Department of Education, this study surveyed about 2,500 people in seven constituent groups (local officials, community leaders, library managers, library service staff, friends, trustees, and library users) across the country to determine which indicators are most useful in distinguishing between effective and ineffective libraries, expecting to find some difference at least between the "internal" librarian group and the "external" local officials and community leaders group.

The preliminary report of the findings indicated that the most important indicators of library effectiveness are (in order):

- Hours open
- Range of materials
- Range of services